

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/14/2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Applicants' amendment and arguments filed on March 14, 2008 have been fully considered, and discussed below. It is noted that applicant has amended the following claims: 1, 22, and 24. Therefore, claims 1-20, 22, and 24 are pending and currently considered for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3691

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irving (US 5,991,74) in view of Lewis (US 6,513,019 B2).

Re Claim 1: Irving discloses a method for monitoring financial exposure in an entity having plurality of operating units, the method comprising:

- Gathering information including at least one product identifier associated with each of said plurality of operating units and at least one collateral identifier associated with each of said plurality of operating units (Column 3, lines 4-20)
- Mapping said at least one product identifier to a standardized product identifier of the entity having the plurality of operating units associating product nomenclature from each of the plurality of operating units with product nomenclature of the entity (Column 7, lines 35-39)
- Mapping said at least one collateral identifier to a standardized collateral identifier of the entity by

associating collateral nomenclature from each of the plurality of operating units with collateral nomenclature of the entity (Column 7, lines 35-39)

- Receiving, from each of said plurality of operating units, unit exposure data identifying an exposure of said operating unit to at least a first customer of said operating unit based on said standardized product identifier and said standardized collateral identifier (Column 7, lines 29-35); and
- Generating aggregated exposure information for said entity related to said at least one customer to indicate a financial exposure of the entity as related to said at least one customer across the plurality of operating units (Column 7, lines 27-35)

Irving does not explicitly disclose: A plurality of operating units

Lewis discloses providing a data processing system and platform that provides an integrated, real-time data and information consolidation and distribution solution for financial institutions (Lewis Column 4, lines 50-53). Examiner notes that it is well known for an entity to contain multiple operating units and it would have been obvious to adapt the teachings of Irving to consider information from multiple operating units of

an entity for the purpose of formulating a consolidated financial picture of the entity in whole (Lewis Column 4, lines 50-53).

Re Claim 2: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Irving further discloses wherein said at least one product identifier includes information identifying at least one of: a unit product name; a standardized product name; a standardized product parent; an effective date; an expiration date; and a point of contact (Fig 6, ice cream)

Re Claim 3: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses wherein said at least one collateral identifier includes information identifying at least one of: a unit collateral name; a standardized collateral name; a standardized collateral parent; an effective date; and a point of contact (Column 3, lines 4-17).

Re Claim 4: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing wherein said at least one collateral identifier indicates that no collateral has been provided, Lewis does note that "a risk manager seeks the total position and cash versus each counterparty and currency integrated with current and complete details of each financial instrument that is traded in customer portfolios (Column 3, lines 7-12)." It would be obvious to anyone skilled in the

ordinary art at the time of invention to conclude that details regarding collateral would be included with this information as it helps to define the total position of one party to another with regards to a particular transaction. It then follows that if no collateral information were listed, then no collateral has been provided because this information would be necessary to know in order to define the customer's position according to the methods of Lewis.

Re Claim 5: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses wherein said customer data includes at least one of: a customer name; a customer address; a customer industry; a credit score name; a credit score; and a credit rating (See Figure 22).

Re Claim 6: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step comprising analyzing said customer data to associate a received customer name with a legal name of said at least first customer, Official Notice is taken that this step is old and well known in the art and would have been obvious to someone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention. Many types of transactions, especially those involving collateral, require a customer to use their legal name. If then, during a future transaction involving the same customer, a variation of that name is used

(for instance if a customer mistakenly uses a common nickname, instead of his full legal name), this would need to be corrected and the true customer account used.

Re Claim 7: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly wherein said analyzing includes retrieving said legal name of said at least first customer from an external data source, this step would have been obvious from the previously rejected method claim 6 above. Since it was established that the full legal name is necessary for certain transactions, and if a customer provides a name different than this name, the legal name would have to be retrieved from another source in order to continue. Furthermore, Lewis does note that the system does receive data records from plural disparate systems and data sources related to customers and counterparties (Column 4, line 54-59).

Re Claim 8: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step of analyzing said customer data to associate a received customer address with a legal name of said at least first customer, Lewis does note that he system does receive data records from plural disparate systems and data sources related to customers and counterparties and derives information from the data. Since many businesses require customers to issue an address along with their account

information (for billing purposes perhaps), it would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention to retrieve (associate) an address for a particular customer when only given the name on the account.

Re Claim 9: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses wherein said unit exposure data includes at least one of: a deal identifier; a transaction identifier; information identifying a customer transaction role; a status of the transaction; a product identifier; a maturity date; information identifying a type of participation of said operating unit; an exposure amount; receivable information for said exposure amount; and a collateral identifier (See Fig 7 and Column 12, lines 2-16).

Re Claim 10: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step comprising comparing said unit exposure data with at least one data standard, Official Notice is taken that this step was well known and would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention. Lewis discloses that risk exposure of a business is dynamically calculated with each transaction (Column 3, lines 1-7). These numbers are calculated for the purposes of analysis and therefore need some type of

benchmark or data standard from which to compare. Without a "data standard," the calculated number is essentially useless.

Re Claim 11: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method *supra* and while not explicitly disclosing the step of rejecting said unit exposure data if said unit exposure data fails to comply with said data standard, Official Notice is taken that this step was well known and would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention. As was noted previously in the rejection of Claim 10 above, Lewis discloses that risk exposure of a business is dynamically calculated with each transaction (Column 3, lines 1-7). The purpose of calculating this risk exposure is to prevent a business from taking on too much risk as a whole. It would be obvious then that there must be some benchmark after which the business decides that their exposure to risk is too great and therefore would reject this exposure data (Column 3, lines 14-17). Otherwise, there would be no reason to calculate risk exposure.

Re Claim 12: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method *supra* and while not explicitly disclosing the step of comparing a plurality of said unit exposure data with a plurality of data standard to generate a failure number and accepting said unit exposure data if said failure number is less than an established

threshold, Lewis does disclose that the "risk manager seeks the firm's total position and cash versus each counterparty and currency, integrated with current and complete details of each financial instrument that is traded in customer portfolios or in the firm's inventory, to input automated risk assessments. Based on the resulting information, the risk manager acts to rebalance positions of the firm so that exposure may be reduced (Column 3, lines 7-14)." While not explicitly noting a failure number, it would have been obvious to anyone skilled in the ordinary art at the time of invention to assume that since a manager rebalances the position of the firm (specifically to reduce risk) based upon the resulting information, that there is a failure number, or some similar variable that is unacceptable to the company.

Re Claim 13: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step of adjusting said established threshold before said comparing step, Official Notice is taken that it was well known in the art at the time of invention that risk-exposure varies depending on a number of factors that are specific to the particular business. It is not out of the ordinary for the estimates of maximum risk exposure to change based upon changes in these factors. It would therefore be obvious to adjust an established threshold of risk

if the need exists, in order to more accurately reflect the business' current position.

Re Claim 14: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses presenting said aggregated exposure information in a first format for review (Column 3, lines 1-17). Specifically there would initially be a non-standardized format of the data.

Re Claim 15: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses receiving a request to present said aggregated exposure information in a second format for review and presenting said aggregated exposure information in said second format (Column 3, lines 1-17). Specifically the information is gathered in a first format and then "standardized" into a second format, so the data can be compared and analyzed on the same plane.

Re Claim 16: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses wherein said aggregated exposure information is aggregated by at least one of: operating unit; customer; collateral; exposure amount; product and geographical area (Column 3, lines 1-17).

Re Claim 17: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and while not explicitly disclosing the step of establishing at least one exposure threshold amount, Lewis does

disclose that inputs from customers can be collected and that from these inputs a risk assessment can be performed and corrective action can be taken. The statement that corrective action can be taken implies that a certain threshold with regards to the inputs has been exceeded and appropriate measures must be taken to correct the problem.

Re Claim 18: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and further discloses the step wherein said at least one exposure threshold amount is established for at least one of: a product; a collateral; a customer; an operating unit; a geographical area; a group of products and a group of operating units (Column 3, lines 1-17). Specifically Lewis notes, "The risk manager also seeks the firm's, or a counterparty's, total position and cash versus each counterparty and currency, integrated with current and complete details of each financial instrument."

Re Claim 19: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses the step of presenting said aggregated exposure information in a first format for review and indicating said at least one exposure threshold amount in said first format (Column 1-17). Specifically there would initially be a non-standardized format of the data that is initially presented before any manipulation takes place.

Re Claim 20: Irving/Lewis discloses the claimed method supra and Lewis further discloses the step of receiving a request to present said aggregated exposure information in a first format for review; performing at least one data analysts on said aggregated exposure information and presenting said aggregated exposure information in said first format for review (Column 3, lines 1-17). Specifically the data is first gathered, standardized, aggregated and consolidated into a first format and then a risk assessment (analysis) is performed on the information. After the analysis, the information can be presented for further review.

Re Claim 22 and 24: see above rejection of claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUKS ONYEZIA whose telephone number is (571)270-1372. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski

can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

C. Onyezia 05/23/2006
/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691